

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 4-9, 11-14, 16-30, 32-34, 36-39 and 41 remain pending. Claims 13, 14, 16-30, 32-34, 36-39 and 41 are rejected. Claims 1, 5-9, 11 and 12 are allowed. Claims 1, 4, 9, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 22, 25, 28-30, 32, 33, and 38 are amended herein. No new matter has been added herein as a result of the amendments. Support for the amendments can be found at least at page 7, lines 29-39.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication that Claims 1, 5-9, 11 and 12 are allowed and that Claims 4, 13, 14, 16-30, 32-34, 36-39 and 41 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the claim objection and rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and 35 U.S.C. §101.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Office Action mailed March 19, 2009, hereinafter referred to as the “instant Office Action” objects to Claims 4 and 13 due to informalities. Claims 4 and 13 are amended herein to correct these informalities. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 4 and 13 overcome the instant objection.

35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 33 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as it is asserted that Claims 33 and 33 lack antecedent basis for the term “said record.” Applicants have amended Claims 33 and 38 herein to recite “a record”.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 33 and 38 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 34, 36, 37, 39 and 41 also overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being dependent from independent Claims 33 and 38, respectively.

35 U.S.C. §101 Rejections - Claims 13, 14, 16-30 and 32

The instant Office Action states that that Claims 13, 14, 16-30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claims are directed towards non-statutory subject matter.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 22, 25, 28-30 and 32 are amended herein to recite a “service manager device” (emphasis added). The instant specification recites “[t]he service location manager 120, the service providers 130 and 132, and the portal 140 are logical entities that can be implemented on a single device or using multiple devices. Thus, system 100 can be representative of, for example, a single computer system that implements the functionality of service location manager 120, service providers 130 and 132, and portal 140” (emphasis added; page 7, lines 29-34).

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the systems as recited in independent Claims 13 and 29 recite a “service manager device”, are directed toward

patentable subject matter, and thus overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 14 and 16-28 that depend from independent Claim 13 and Claims 30 and 32 that depend from independent Claim 29 also overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being dependent on claims that overcomes the instant rejection.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the objected to and rejected claims. Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 4 and 13 overcome the objections of record and that Claims 13, 14, 16-30, 32-34, 36-39 and 41 overcome the rejections of record, and therefore Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER BLECHER LLP

Date: June 19, 2009

/John P. Wagner, Jr./

John P. Wagner, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,398

Westridge Business Park
123 Westridge Drive
Watsonville, CA 95076
(408) 377-0500